

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-7, 9-23, and 27-34 will remain in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 18-23 and 27-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Bachand et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0115424, hereinafter "Bachand").

Applicants teach compression techniques for a trace operation, which may be used for debugging. Since loops may create redundant information in the trace buffer, which has limited storage capacity, the compression techniques may improve performance by keeping resources available and prevent delays due to emptying the trace buffer in response to trace buffer full exceptions.

Bachand is not directed to improving trace buffer performance, but rather to another problem, cache coherency. In fact, a text search of the Bachand indicates that the term "trace" is not even mentioned. Cache coherency is not used for debugging, but rather to insure that different agents utilizing the same cache are supplied the most current copy of the information in the cache. Furthermore, the "transactions" that are blocked relate to data, not address pairs corresponding to loops, as recited in the claims.

Consider exemplary claim 18, as amended, which recites in relevant part:

"...performing a trace operation including storing fetched instructions in a trace buffer, said storing comprising storing an address pair corresponding to a loop in the trace buffer"

Bachand does not disclose or suggest performing a trace operation. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 18 and 27, and their dependencies, are allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-7, 12-17, and were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Panigrahi (U.S. Patent No. 3,975,717).

Claims 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Panigrahi in view of Bachand.

The limitations of claim 8 has been included in claim 1. Independent claims 1 and 13 are directed to a trace buffer. Neither Panigrahi nor Bachand are directed to trace buffers. Text searches of both references show that neither reference even mentions the term "trace". Since neither Panigrahi nor Bachand teaches or suggests, either alone or in combination, a trace buffer, let alone one capable of performing a compression operation, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 13, and their dependencies, are allowable.

Please substitute the enclosed SIX (6) sheets of formal drawings for the corresponding drawings presently in the application. Applicants submit that no new matter is introduced.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit
account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 5, 2004



Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Attorneys for Intel Corporation
PTO Customer No. 20985
Fish & Richardson P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

/BY
KENYON S. JENCKES
REG. NO. 41,873

10422772.doc